

A defence of that which hath bin  
written in the questions of the ig-  
norant ministerie, and the communicating  
with them. By Iohn PENNY. 1643

**T** Here bee two thinges (M. D.  
*Some*) wherein you by oppug-  
ning that trueth which out of  
the worde of God I had sette  
downe, concerning the two former  
questions, haue beene wanting both  
vnto your selfe and to the cause; the  
defence whereof you vndertook. The  
former want of the 1. appeareth by  
your spare dealing in a matter of such  
great waight, wherein you haue dealt  
with so illiberall a hande, that what  
hath bin written by you, might seem  
to proceed rather from any, then fro  
a man whose giftes and learning seem-  
ed to promise the affordinge, of  
greater and more waightie matters,  
then any set downe in that treatise.

The number of my reasons were ma-  
ny, you onely haue touched 1. of the,  
the rest are not dealt with. And ther-  
fore the cause as yet remaineth whol.  
For be it you had answered these 1.

Penny (2)  
K

as you haue not, yet had you not satisfied the doubtful conscience of those that know not in these points which way to turn them, as long as any one of my reasons remained vnanfwered.

In this point there is also another want, which I would had bin redressed. And that is of two sorts. First, a manifest going from the controuersie; For the question being, whether ignorant men, not ordained of God for the gatheringe together of the Saints, be ministers or no; you leaue that, and prooue the Sacraments administered by them, viz. by popishe priests, and our dumbe ministers in the daies of blindnes and ignorance to be sacraments, which is no part of the matter in controuersie, but another point to be discussed (if men will be gotten at all to enter therevnto) when the former is determined and decided.

Secondly, your reasons are so few, & so commonly knowen vnto all, that for their number, a small deale of paper might containe an answere vnto them,





• them, for their noueltie, they could not put a man that had accordinge vnto knowledge, but once allowed of the cause, to anye great labour in answering them. As being things so commonly obiected by all, learned or vnlearned, that holde our readers to be ministers, and thinke it lawfull to communicate with them, as by course of spech they fall vnto that discourse, wher al men may easily see, that there was a great oversight committed by M. S O M E, in deeming that the opugning of a cause countenanced by most of the godly learned, would be taken in hand by any, who could not answere the reasons which he might be sure would be obiected by al. And who could be ignorant, that the odious controuerſie, concerning the profanation of baptisme, both by popish priests & our dumb ministers, would offer it selfe in the forefront to withstand the trueth; that the ciuill magistracie, the ministerie of the dumbe leuites, the corrupt outward calling, of our readers woulde require an answer,

as you haue not, yet had you not satisfied the doubtful conscience of those that know not in these points which way to turn them, as long as any one of my reasons remained vnanfwered.

In this point there is also another want, which I would had bin redressed. And that is of two sorts. First, a manifest going from the controuersie; For the question being, whether ignorant men, not ordained of God for the gatheringe together of the Saints, be ministers or no; you leaue that, and prooue the Sacraments administered by them, viz. by popish priests, and our dumbe ministers in the daies of blindnes and ignorance to be sacraments, which is no part of the matter in controuersie, but another point to be discussed (if men will be gotten at all to enter therevnto) when the former is determined and decided.

Secondly, your reasons are so few, & so commonly knowen vnto all, that for their number, a small deale of paper might containe an answere vnto them,



- them, for their noueltie, they could not put a man that had accordinge vnto knowledge, but once allowed of the cause, to anye great labour in answering them. As being things so commonly objected by all, learned or vnlearned, that holde our readers to be ministers, and thinke it lawfull to communicate with them, as by course of spech they fall vnto that discourse, wher al men may easily see, that there was a great oversight committed by M. S O M E, in deeming that the opugning of a cause countenanced by most of the godly learned, would be taken in hand by any, who could not answere the reasons which he might be sure would be objected by al. And who could be ignorant, that the odious controuersie, concerning the profanation of baptisme, both by popish priests & our dumb ministers, would offer it selfe in the forefront to withstand the truth / that the ciuill magistracie, the ministerie of the dumbe leuites, the corrupt outward calling, of our readers would require an answer,

swere, which are the reasons, and the onely reasons vsed by you.

The last want I finde in you, is contained in the insufficiency of your reasons, which evidently shew the insufficiencie of the cōclusion, that would be inferred by them. Your reasons are all of them faultie, eyther because they desire that for granted which is the question, or make those things of like nature, wherein there is a gret dissimilitude. Frō the first of the 2. faults it commeth to passe, that you take for granted, that the writings of reuerende and godly men, as of Augustine, M. Beza, &c. will prooue that, which the word of the eternall God doth not warrant. Hence you take it graunted, that popish priests were ministers: that the outwarde approbation of the Church maketh a minister; that whensoever the word of institution is pronounced with the outward element, ther must presently be a Sacrament, that I take an euill minister for no minister; that there was a nullity both of Caiphas his ministry,



nisterie, because he came in by briberye, and of the litigious ministers in the Church of Philippi, &c. Howsoever you take those things as granted principles, yet they are the points in controuersie, and so far from beeing yelded vnto by me, that I haue shewed euery one of them to be manifestly false. 1. Phil. 1.  
15.

The dissimilitude is in the reasons drawn from the Leuitical priesthood, and the ciuill magistracie, with whom if you compare the ministry of the new couenaunt, you shall finde, firste that you bring in a similitude to shew that whiche is not prooued; and secondly that you make those to be twinnes, which all men must needs graunt to be as vnlike, as crooked & straight lines are vnmatchable.

And thus much I thought needfull generally to set downe concerninge your manner of dealing: Not that I wold any way disgrace, you who I reuerence, for that is no part of mine intent, the Lorde is my witnes. Nay, I would be loth to let that syllable escape

scape me, that might giue you or any  
els the least occasion in the world, to  
thinke that I carrye any other heart  
towards you, then I ought to beare  
towards a reuerend learned man fea-  
ring God. And howsoeuer, vnles you  
alter your iudgment, I can neuer agre  
with you in these pointes; becaule I  
am assured you swarue frō the truth:  
yet this disagreement shalbe so farre  
from making a breach of that bonde  
of loue', wherewith in the Lord I am  
tyed vnto you, that I doubt not, but  
we shalbe at one in that day, when al  
of vs shall be at vnitie in him that re-  
mayneth one and the selfe-same for  
euer.

Now I am to come to your booke,  
from the 20. page whereof, vnto the  
28. laying the foundation of the rea-  
sons you vse against mee, to prooue  
the lawfulness of communicinge  
with dum ministers, you handle two  
needles points. First that they which  
were baptized by popish priests, haue  
receined true baptim as touching  
the substance. Secondly that they are  
the

the sacramentes of baptisme and the holy supper of the Lorde, which are deliuered in the Church of England by vnpreching ministers. In these two pointes M. Some, you haue prooned nothing that my writings haue denied; but you haue quickened a dead controuersie, not vnlikely to giue the wrangling spirits of this age, cause to breed greater sturres in the Church. I see no other effect, which the handling of these questions can bring forth but this. And it is to be feared that the slendernes of the reasons vsed in your booke, to prooue that which you haue vndertaken to shew; will geue occasion vnto mannie, whoe of them-selues are too too readie to iangle, to doubt of that wherof before they made no question. So that by seeking to stay the course of a needful cōtrouersie, you haue both giuen it a larger passage, and opened the doore vnto a question very fruitlesse in our time. you know I deale in neither of these pointes. If you cannot be stayed from entring into contro-

trouerfies, that are very odious, and  
 more impertinent vnto the matter  
 in hand: it were good that the church  
 were further and more soundly satisfi-  
 ed by you in these 2. pointes, which  
 you alone in our Church haue pub-  
 likly called in question. And for mine  
 owne parte, when you haue done, I  
 know not who will be your aduersa-  
 rie, I see no reason whie I should deal  
 in controuerfies of so smal gaine. Of  
 this I am assured, that neyther po-  
 pish priests, nor any other ignorant  
 guides are ministers. whether the ele-  
 ment administred by the, be a sacra-  
 ment or no, look you to that, which  
 haue in your treatise debated that,  
 which my writings neuer called into  
 question. If you wil needs proue rea-  
 ders to be ministers, because you can  
 not get me to denie that which hath  
 bene administred to be a sacrament,  
 you shall but presse that which will  
 prooue nothing. Your reason is, as if  
 you shoulde saye, that eyther all they  
 which supplie the places of ministers  
 are ministers, or els an inconuenience



is likely to follow. A strange manner of demonstration, Gods ordinaunce must needs be thrust out of the dores because an inconuenience would be likely to ensue the admittinge of it. The cause will not be thus answered, at your hands; and I am sorie that a man so reuerende in mine eyes, hath dealt so vnsubstantially in a matter belonging to the seruice of the euer-living God: the slenderesse of the reason is apparant. In the latter ende of the booke I haue farther shewed the same; thither I am to referre you and the reader.

Now I coulde well ouerpasse these two pointes, because of them selues they containe nothing that I haue withstoode: But in as muche as you haue not onely grounded them vpon false principles, and such as in no wise can be warraunted by the canon of the word, but also inferre vpon their grant, that our readers are ministers, and consequently, that it is no sinne to communicate with them. I am first to set downe the state of the questi-

trouerfies, that are very odious, and more impertinent vnto the matter in hand: it were good that the church were further and more foundly satisfied by you in these 2. pointes, which you alone in our Church haue publickly called in question. And for mine owne parte, when you haue done, I know not who will be your aduersarie, I see no reason whie I should deal in controuerfies of so smal gaine. Of this I am assured, that neyther popish priests, nor any other ignorant guides are ministers. whether the element administred by the, be a sacrament or no, look you to that, which haue in your treatise debated that, which my writings neuer called into question. If you wil needs proue readers to be ministers, because you can not get me to denie that which hath bene administred to be a sacrament, you shall but presse that which will prooue nothing. Your reason is, as if you shoulde saye, that cyther all they which supplie the places of ministers are ministers, or els an inconuenience

is likely to follow. A strange manner of demonstration, Gods ordinance must needs be thrust out of the dores because an inconuenience would be likely to ensue the admittinge of it. The cause will not be thus answered, at your hands; and I am sorie that a man so reuerende in mine eyes, hath dealt so vnsubstantially in a matter belonging to the seruice of the euer-liuing God: the slenderesse of the reason is apparant. In the latter ende of the booke I haue farther shewed the same; thither I am to referre you and the reader.

Now I coulde well ouerpasse these two pointes, because of them. selues they containe nothing that I haue withstoode: But in as muche as you haue not onely grounded them vpon false principles, and such as in no wise can be warraunted by the canon of the word, but also inferre vpon their grant, that our readers are ministers, and consequently, that it is no sinne to communicate with them. I am first to set downe the state of the questi-

on, which in deed is and ought to be decided betweene you and me concerninge the elemente administred, both by popish priests, and other vnpreaching ministers: and secondly to examine the groundes whereby you prooue the element alreadie deliuered by them to be a sacrament, which you know I do not denie to be so.

And this  
is the  
point that  
concerneth  
our  
state rather  
then  
the other.

The question therefore is not whether the one or the other of them haue deliuered a sacrament in respect of the action done; but whether a christian going vnto them for those holy seales, may be assured, that hee can receiue the same at their handes. I affirme that wee can not; M. Some taketh it graunted that we may; my warrant is out of the worde, because there is no promise made to vs therein, that the action celebrated by such men, is a sacramentall action, and where there is no promise, there can bee no assurance, because our assurance ariseth onely of fayth, whiche must be grounded vpon the promises set downe in the word; wee haue

no



no promise that they can deliuer vs a sacrament, because they are no ministers. For they onely are enioyned by our Sauour Christ to deliuer a sacrament, neither do we know what hee can deliuer which is no minister.

Matth. 28.  
18.19.

So that the question is now growne to this issue, whether popish priestes and our vnpreaching ministers, bee ministers or no; whom if I can proue to be none, then the matter is cleare, that no man going vnto them for the sacrament, can assure himselfe there to haue the same. And this shall be a generall reason, equally belonging vnto both the pointes handeled by you, the particulars whereof shal follow in their places.

*That no popishe priest therefore is a minister.*

1 Euery minister must be at the least by profession, a member of the true Church. No popish prist is by profession a member of the true Church. Therefore no popish priest is a minister.

2 Euery minister hath an office with in the bodie of the Church. No

Rom. 12. 4  
5. 6.

popishe priest hath an office with-  
in the bodie of the Church. Ther-  
fore no popish priest is a minister.  
The propositions or first part of both  
these reasons are set downe eident-  
ly and plainly by the wisdome of  
God, in these wordes. For as we haue  
many members in one bodie, and all  
members haue not one office; so we  
being many, are one bodie in Christ,  
and euerye one an others members,  
seeing then that we haue giftes that  
are diuers. &c.

The place sheweth cleerly, that who-  
soeuer is not a member, is not of the  
bodie, if not of the body, then no mi-  
nister. Againe, who soeuer is no mem-  
ber, he hath no office in the bodie; if  
no office, no minister. He that should  
object that in this place is mentea  
member of the bodie, by election in  
the secret counsell of God, and not  
in the acknowledgement of the  
Church by profession, would not de-  
serue the answering. Because it is vo-  
cation and not election, that maketh  
such a member in the church as may  
haue

haue an office therein; of which sort  
 the Apostle speaketh in this place. by  
 vocation, I meane that whereof the  
 holy ghoſte ſpeaketh, where it is ſaid,  
 Many are called, but few are choſen: Math. 20.  
 neither can any man denie him to be 10.  
 a member of the Church, which by  
 outward profeſſion ſubmitteth him-  
 ſelfe vnto true religion, and ſuch are  
 the members, whereof the Apoſtle  
 ſpeaketh: namely ſuch as are members  
 in the iudgement of the Church. Iu-  
 das was a member in the iudgement  
 of the Church, though not belong-  
 ing to election. A further prooſe of  
 the propoſitions you ſhall find. 1. cor.  
 12. 26, 28. Hee was no prieſt in the  
 olde teſtament, that was not a Iewe  
 by profeſſion; yea, and of the line of  
 Aaron to: and ſhall he be accounted  
 a miniſter among vs, that is a ſtranger  
 from the profeſſion of the trueth, &  
 a profeſſed Idolater? Iſhmael & Eſau,  
 were circumcized, and the ſonnes of  
 thoſe fathers vnto whome the cou-  
 naunt was made; Euen I will be thy  
 God, & the God of thy ſeed. They &

To be a  
 member  
 ſo the true  
 Church  
 is one  
 thing, and  
 to bee a  
 true mem-  
 ber of the  
 Church is  
 another  
 thing.

their posterities fell from true religion: well admit that the profanation of circumcision had still continued in their houses: yet a man supplying the place of a priest among them, was no priest in deed, though he ten thousand times profaned circumcision, and would brag neuer so often, that he worshipped after his Idolatrous maner, no other God but the God of his father Abraham, & sware onely by the feare of his father Isaak. The reason herof, is, because that euery priest vnder the law, must be an Israelite by profession, that is a member of the true Church, neither could any of the godly assure them-selues, that an Edomitish priest administred true circumcision according to the substance. Now I reke of a popish priest no otherwise then I would haue done of an Ismaelitishe or Edomitish circumciser; the profanation of that seal of the couenant, still continuing in mount Seir.

Whereas in the assumption or second part of both the reasons, I deny popish priestes to be members of the Church;



church; my meaning is not that there are none of the elect, within the bodie of poperie, whom the Lorde may call in his good time: For I would not denie this vnto Mahometism, or that there are not left in poperie certaine rubishes and steps of true religion, for this difference I make betweene the and other Infidels, though the Iewes also may claim this vnto themselves. But I meane that the popish religion is such a religion as whosoever liueth and dyeth in the profession thereof: he liueth & dieth out of the Church, where saluation is not possibly to be had, for any thing that is made known vnto man. Whence it necessarily followeth, that in poperie there is no Church. If it be objected that the papistes are within the couenaunt, inas- much as long since they professed the trueth. Mine answer wil be, that popery was neuer the trueth as yet, that no papist in that he was a papist, euer professed the trueth, and that God made no couenant with professed Idolators, as all papists are.

Anti-

1. Thes. 1.

4

Antichrist I grant should sit as God in the temple of God; but it was neuer the temple of God, since he planted his pestilent chaire therein. Poperie in deede hath inuaded the seats and possessions of true religion, and began first where the trueth was professed: For the myserie of iniquitie first appeared within the Church, & not else where, where true religion flourished, and not among the heathen: neyther coulde he be that aduersarie, whose beginning shoulde be in Paganisme. But although poperie tooke roote in the soyle where the true Church was planted; yet it so grew there, that it still continued to be the synagogue of Sathan, & could neuer as yet be the Church of God; howsoeuer it hath ouergrown the possession thereof, And what though their fathers, who nowe are papistes, were within the couenant, as professing true religion; shall it therefore followe that their Idolatrous sonnes should be so to: If they returne the Lorde hath mercie in store for them.

JMA

I

I denie not. But what is there in this point said for the papistes, which the Iewes cannot with far more shewe of reason pretend for themselves? The profaning of baptism among the papistes can make them no more to be within the Church, then the continuance of the profanation of circumcision among the Ishmaelites & Edomites could keepe them out of the covenant. And why should Ioppish baptism any more tie the Iewes covenant to an Idolatrous race, then an Ishmaelitish or Edomitish cutting off of the foreskinne, linke him to be the God of those adulterous generations. Oh, but the Lorde himselfe hath sayd, In Isaak shall thy seed be called, and Iacob haue I loued, and hated Esau; while the same Lorde in respect of his reuealed wil, for with his secret election men must not meddle, hath saide, the professors of true religion do I loue, but the Idolatrous papists my soule abhorreth; It will be heere demanded, whether I make no more account of popish baptism, then of

Rom. 9. 7.

Gen. 21. 12.

Mal. 1. 2. 3.

Rom. 9. 13.

Edomitish circumcision, I see no reason why I shoulde. For a circumcised Edomite being receiued, to be a true worshipper at Iernsalem, shoulde as well content himselfe with that circumcision (circumcision being not a thing inuented by man, or don in respect of man, but ordained by the Lord, and done in regarde of the covenant made vnto Abraham) as wee do with popish baptism, which is not called in question.

And yet that which is spoken concerning the profession of the trueth, by the forefathers, is not altogether true in poperye; for there be many large regions nowe professing popery, where not so much as the name of Christ was heard, vntill they were become grossely popishe. So that their first step was out of paganisme vnto poperye. And this is the estate of all those poor oppressed vassals the west Indians, who now in great numbers profes Romish Idolatrie. For at such time as the Spanyard inuading their land, brought vppon them the most  
misera-



miserable flauery of bodie and soule, that are vpon any people vnder heauen, they had not so much as heard whether there was anye Christe, but were most heethnish, & seuerall Idolaters, as may appeare by the popish hystoriographers them-selues, who wrote the stories of those times. And therefore (to omit, whose posterities many of the nations within Europe are, that haue refused the light of the Gospell) though it were granted, that the rest of the popish rable were with in the couenant, yet these miserable heeth papists, can be said to be vnder no couenant, but that which is made vnto poperie and paganisme. I hope M<sup>r</sup> Sars, howsoeuer you may be perswaded, that other popish shauelings can deliuer a sacrament, yet that you will doubt, whether any man could be assured to receiue those holy seals at the handes of the heathen malmongers remaining in Cuba, hispaniola, Mexico, or any other the Eastern partes.

And thus muche concerning the  
assump-

Peter. M.  
de rebus  
Occeanicis. Decad  
4.5.

M. Calvin  
epist. 103.

assumption, I am not ignorant that famous and worthy men, haue otherwise written concerning the popishe Church, and therefore I am not to be pressed with theyr authority.

I might in the 3. place vse agaynst you M. Sme, a reason of your owne thus concluded, No ministrye is sacriledge, because euery ministrye is an ordinance of God, which cannot be turned vnto sacrilege. The popish prishood is sacrileg, as you haue set downe, page 21. Therefore the popish priesthood is no ministry, and consequently popish priests are no ministers. You may see that you haue overthrowne your owne cause. But this manner of reasoning, although it should be of force against your selfe, inasmuch as your owne wordes are brought to expresse your owne meaning, yet I account insufficient, my third reason therefore is this,

3 They are no ministers whose very ministrye overthroweth directly the priesthood of our sanior christ But the very ministry of popishe priests,

priests, directly ouertroweth the  
priesthood of Christ: therefore  
they are no ministers.

I know not what can be pretended  
against the proposition, vlesse men  
woulde dreame of a ministry, wyth  
whom the priesthood of the Lord Je-  
sus cannot stande. The latter part of  
the reason is true, if it bee true, that  
Christ is the onely sacrifice for sinne;  
that he is no more to be offered, that  
by once offering himselfe, he hath  
made full satisfaction for the finnes  
of the whole worlde, and that the po-  
pish priestes dayly sacrifice to appease  
Gods wrath, for the finnes of the  
quicke and the dead.

Heb. 9.28.  
& 10.10.  
1. iohn 1.7  
act. 4.12.  
Ephes. 1.7.  
Heb. 10.  
12.15. and  
9.26.  
Heb. 5.25.  
& 10.14. &  
9.14.

Lastly, they are no ministers who are  
made, that is, called, elected & or-  
dained by Idolaters. Popish priests  
are called, chosen and ordained by  
Idolaters. Therefore they are no  
ministers.

The proposition appeareth in that  
a minister can be made by none, but  
by such as vnto whom the Lord hath  
giuen leaue to deale in that action, o-  
ther.

therwise the action is frustrate. As if  
a company of women, though religi-  
ous and godly, shoulde goe about to  
make a minister, the action is no-  
thing. Of the assumption that popish  
priests are made by Idolators, I make  
no question. And when did god giue  
Idolators leaue to make ministers.

Seing therefore that popish priests  
are no ministers, I see no shew of pro-  
babilitie wherevpon my sayth, or the  
faith of any can be assured to receiue  
true baptisme at their hands: vnlesse  
it can be shewed by you, M. Sams, that  
eyther there may bee sayth where  
there is no promise, or that there is  
a promise to receaue a sacramente  
where there is no minister, which no  
man of any christian modestie wil af-  
firme. Hence also it followeth, that  
neyther the obstinate orie of recu-  
sants in this land, who offer their chil-  
dren to be profaned by trayterous &  
runnagate Iesuits, nor any els within  
the body of the Romish Babylon, can  
assure themselues that their children  
receiue the substance of baptisme.

My



My reasons besides that they are no ministers, are these. And I desire that they may be examined by you, good M. Some; where you must remember that I speake not of that which hath bene done yesterday, but of the assurance that may be had of that which to morow is to be done.

Where there is no true christ wherunto men can bee engrafted by baptism: There true baptism as touching the substance cannot be gotten, for what baptism is that, which is not an ingraftinge into the true Christ.

But in popery there is no true christ, wherunto men may be ingrafted, because he is not the true Christe, who eyther will not, or cannot satisfie the wrath of God for the sinnes of the elect, without their merites, and such is the Christ professed in popery and no other.

Therefore men can not be assured to haue the substance of baptism in the popish Church.

No man can assure himself to haue the

Rom. 6.3.

gal. 3.27.

Rom. 5.15

19.

Heb. 5.25.

the substance of baptisme out of the Church, and that by those that are without the Church, for then a sacramēt might be had out of the Church, which were very impious and absurd to be affirmed.

But popery is out of the Church, and so are all popish priests.

Therefore no man can assure himself to have the substance of baptism in popery by any popish priest.

That there is no Church at all in popery, and that all popish priests are out of the Church, besides the former reasons, this one doth further shewe. If there be a Church in popery, or if all popish priests be not out of the Church, then those magistrates that have separated themselves and their subiectes (and all others that made this separation) from the Romish religion, as from that synagogue where salvation is not to be had, and consequently, where there is no Church, are schismatikes, to speake the least. Because it is a schisme to make this separation from the Church, detest the

the corruptions thereof we may, but make suche a separation from the Church, wee ought not vnlesse wee would be accounted schismaticks. But those magistrates and their people, that made this separation, are not schismatickes, because in popery the foundation is ouerthrowen. You say in your booke (M. Some) page 33. that you could presse the argument of the magistracie against me very far; whether you may or no, that shall be considered when I deale with the point; but this I am assured off, that in this point, you shall be driven either to defend the absurditie, that baptisme is to bee had out of the Church in a companye estranged from Christe, which I thinke you will not doe, or vrged so farre, as to the plaine breach of a statute (which far be it from me) even in the cause of treason. Will yee say that baptisme may be had out of the Church: the assertion is absurd; or will you hold that there is a church in popery? the assertiō is dangerous, and I haue prooued it false. It is dan-

E

ge-

13. Eliza.  
A strange Church  
that hath  
not Christ  
for the  
foundati-  
on.

133

My meaning is  
only to  
shew the  
danger, &  
not to  
presse the  
same.

gerous, because it affirmeth our magistrates to be schismatiks, inasmuch as they have seperated theselues from the Church: I hope rather then you will fall into eyther of these pointes, that you will grant me the cause.

Lastly, it men might be assured that they could have the true substance of baptisme in popery, then they ought not to keep their children from popish baptisme, if there were no other baptisme in the world to be had. For men might come to their baptisme and detest their corruptions, if it bee Gods baptisme, as you M. ~~Some~~ affirmed it to be, page 20. And they can ad an edifying worde vnto the sacrament: if the recitall of the wordes of institution be an edifying worde, and that be sufficient to make a sacramēt, both whiche you have written, page 22. 24. But men ought rather to keep their children vnbaptized, then to offer them to be profaned by popish baptisme, both for the former reasons, and because wee ought to have no more fellowship with papists in the ser-



seruice of God, then with pagan Idolaters. M. Caluin hath written otherwise in this point, therefore againe I appeale to the word.

L. 2o. Epist. 10. 4.

Seing therefore in popery there is no Church, no ministry, no Christe; seeing we ought in no case to be ioyned with papists in their religion, but to bee separated from them, as from those that are out of the church; and such as are become a very filthy cage and nest of vncleane and sacrilegious Idolators: therefore also it necessarily followeth, that neither our popish recusants, nor any else, offering their children to bee baptized in the popish synagogue, by those polluted and vncleane priests; may assure themselves that they can bee there partakers of true baptisme, as touchinge the substance of baptisme.

Nowe to the examination of your reason brought to prooue that they which were baptized in popery, haue receiued true baptisme. Your conclusion you must remember, I do not deny, though your reason proueth

not the same, which is thus framed.

Whosoever deliuer Gods baptism, they deliuer true baptism; but popish priestes deliuer Gods baptism: therefore true baptism.

You haue changed the conclusion from that which was done, vnto that whiche is done, but this oversight I omit the assumption you thus proue.

Whosoever baptise in the name, not of Pope or Idols, but of the holy Trinitie, they deliuer Gods baptism; but popishe priests do baptize in the name of the holy trinitie: therefore they deliuer Gods baptism.

Your proposition in this last syllogisme, is most false, and such as vpon the grant whereof, not onely the communicating with vnpreaching ministers, might bee aduouched, but also Gods whole ordinaunce in the institution of his holy sacramentes quite ouerthrowen. For if it were true that ther were no more required to make substantiall baptism (as you here require no more) but to baptise in the name of the trinitie; then these impious

pious absurdities would follow thereof.

1 That an Amalekite might deli-  
uer true circumcision, as touching  
the substance. 2 That true baptism  
might bee administred vnto a sub-  
staunce not capable of baptisme, but  
this odious instance I will not vrge.  
3 That a woman, 4 That any man  
not being a minister, as a child of five  
yeares olde, a Turke or Iewe might  
deliuer true baptism as touching the  
substance. For these pronouncing the  
wordes of institution, might reteine  
by your reason, the essential form of  
Christes baptisme, and so to vse your  
owne wordes; they baptizing not in  
the name of Pope or of Idols, but of  
the holy trinitie, should deliuer Gods  
baptism and not mans? if Gods bap-  
tisme, then true baptisme I am sure.  
in like manner, by this reason they  
should be Catabaptistes, which denie  
men to be rightly baptized by Turks  
or women. I would be full sorie that  
the errors of the Katabaptists or A-  
nabaptistes, could be confuted  
by

by you withe sounder reasons then this you haue brought; and I would be also sorie that you should defende such absurd cōsequents as I wil driue you whether you will or no, vnlesse you reuoke (as I hope you will) that which you haue writtē. pardone me I pray you. I deale as tenderly as I may with you, retaining the maiestie of the cause I defend; and I deale not against you, but against an erroneous assertion, which I now leaue; desiring you very earnestly, that you woulde consider how vnreuerently the ordinance of God in the holy sacraments is dealt with when the same is made to depend vpon the pronouncing of a few syllables, without any consideration eyther of the person who is to administer, or of the substantiall forme of consecration contained in the exposition of the holy institution of baptisme, and the innocation of the name of God, al which are necessarily required in the administration of baptisme, and could not possibly be in Egypt, where all was and  
is



covered vnder the darknesse of a  
 strange tongue. Your distinction that  
 popish priests haue a calling, though  
 a falsie, is a begging of the question.  
 For as I haue shewed, popish priestes  
 haue no calling at all in the Church,  
 and therefore how can they sit in the  
 chaire of the ministerie? Is there a  
 ministry out of the Church, Caiphas  
 his priesthood commeth afterwarde  
 to bee considered of. The seconde  
 point is to be handled next.

*That unpreaching ministers are no ministers.*

They are affirmed to bee no mini-  
 sters, not because they are euill mini-  
 sters, but because their ministrye is  
 an euill and profane mininistry: So  
 that in this pointe the faulte is not  
 found with the euill minister, but with  
 the euill ministry. Their ministry is  
 profane and euill, because there is no  
 mention made of it in the word. And  
 a ministrye not mentioned in the  
 worde is no ministry but a profane  
 constitution. For the Lorde hath ex-  
 pressely set downe euerye ministerie  
 of the new testament, that should be

that

in

**Ephe. 2. 11** in the Church vnto the worlds ende; whereas he hath not once mentioned the ministry of our readers, because it is not a preaching ministrye. The summe of this whole controuersie is containd in these three axiomes.

**Rom. 12. 6.** 1 Every ministry is expressly set downe in the word.

**1. Cor. 42.** 2 Every ministry of the newe testament is a preaching ministry.

**28. Rom. 10**  
**14. 1. Cor.** 3 The ministry of our vnpreaching ministers, is not a preaching ministrye.

**2. 21.**

If you can shewe eyther of these 3. points to be false, I am ouerthrowne, if neyther, you must yeeld. The truth of all three, I haue shewed out of the word, in the last edition of my book. The two former are confirmed by the places quoted on the margent, the latter I will briefly prooue by these reasons.

1. If the ministry of vnpreaching ministers be a preaching ministrye, or if their function be a pastorall or doctorall function, then there had bene a preaching ministry, a pastorall

all and doctōrall function known in the Church, though there neuer had bene anye preacher therein. Otherwise, howe can their minillerye bee a preaching ministry, or their function bee a pastorall function, whereas the same may bee in the Church, no preaching ministry or pastorall function beeing knowne there? But no Church, much lesse a ministry had there bene knowne, if there neuer had bene any that coulde haue preached; because God ordained the saints and so a Church, onely to be gathered together by preaching ordinarily, but not by the ministry of readers, because it might haue bene in the world, and yet no saint gathered thereby; which thing experience in our Church prooueth to bee true.

My 2. and 3. reasons are drawn out of these words of Paule, Rom. 12. 6. 7. 8. Seeing then that wee haue giftes that are diuers, according to the grace that is giuen vnto vs; whether wee haue prophesie, let vs prophesie, ac-

cording to the proportion of sayth;  
or an office, let vs wait on the office;  
or hee that teacheth on teaching, or  
he that exhorteth on exhorting, &c.  
the 1. reason is thus concluded.

Whoſoeuer hath receiued a mini-  
ſterye, and ſo a paſtorall or doctorall  
function, he hath receiued prophesie  
ſpoken of in this place, verſe 6. Be-  
cauſe euery paſtoral or doctorall fun-  
ction, mencioned in the 7. & 8. verſe,  
vnder theſe words: he that teacheth,  
hee that exhorteth; are contained  
vnder the word prophesie, verſe 6. In-  
ſomuch as he that hath not receiued  
that prophesie there ſet down, wher-  
by is ment the interpretation of the  
worde; he hath not receiued the pa-  
ſtorall or doctoral function ſet down  
verſ. 7, 8. But vnpreaching miniſters  
haue not receiued the prophesie ſpo-  
ken of in this place, which is expreſly  
ſet downe, verſe 6. to bee one of the  
diuers gifts beſtowed for the gouer-  
nēt of the body, which is the church.  
Therefore alſo, they haue receiued  
neither a paſtorall nor a doctorall  
fun-



function, and so no preaching ministry.

3 No ministry is separated from a gift, because prophesie spoken of in this 6. verse, vnder which as we see, euery pastorall and doctorall ministry is contayned, can not bee seuered from a gift: but the ministry of our readers is seuered in them from a gift: therefore in them it is no ministry.

It is no ministrye in them I say, although that ministrye, the generall name whereof they haue, is not seuered from a gift in preaching ministers: but what is that to them? what is the ministrye of other men vnto them? they are not ministers, by the ministry wherewith other men are endued, but by their own, which being seuered from a gifte, is no ministry. Paul had bene no Apostle, and had receiued no Apostleship, vnlesse he coulde haue sayde, I am a minister according vnto the grace giuen vnto me, Ephe. 3. 7. and not according to the grace giuen vnto other Apostles;  
the

the generall name of whose Apostleship I am entituled with. A ridiculous speeche it were to saye mine apostleship hath receiued grace, but I that am the apostle haue receiued none.

How then may our readers claime a preaching ministry vnto themselves, seing the ministry which they challenge is altogether in them without a gifte, though it be not so in others?

4 Every vnpreaching minister sinneth in executing the works of a pastoral function, as the sacraments. &c therefore he hath no ministry; and so nyether a pastorall nor doctorall function. 'Hee hath no ministry, because his calling is not; the calling of the ministry, his callinge is not the calling of the ministrye, because hee sinneth in intermedlinge withe the workes thereof. And this is an infalible trueth, that no man sinneth because he dealeth with the workes of his calling. For this is the duety that God requireth at the hands of every man. Manye sinne in deede because they

they walk corruptly in their callings, & haue no care to glorifie God therein. Col. 3. 17. But leaue thy corruption and thou sinnest not, in keeping thee to the works of thy calling. The hypocrits in the daies of Isayah. 1. 13 sinned not because they offered sacrifice, but because they did the same through hypocrisie. Their hypocrisie they ought to haue leste, but not his seruice in sacrificing according to his commaundement; but our readers though they should with as little corruption, and as great zeale to Gods glory and the good of his Church as any men, deale in the workes of a pastoral ministry, yet they should stil do that which the Lord had forbidden them to doe, whence it appeareth, that the works of the ministry are not the works of their calling. For God forbiddeth no man to deale therewith, & not the being workes of their calling, they are no ministers, and haue neyther pastorall nor doctorall function.

5 This is farther shewed, forasmuch

as the Lorde doeth not commit vnto  
bare reders the charge of those soules,  
ouer whom they are, which he doth  
vnto euerye one that hath a pastorall  
function, Acts. 20. 26. 28. 1. thes. 5. 12  
Heb. 13. 17. For to what ende else,  
should he commit a ministerye vnto  
any, who haue soules vnder their  
charge? The Church indeed may com-  
mit the soules of men vnto reders, but  
certainly the Lord committeth none  
vnto them. And he is no minister, vn-  
to whom the Lorde doth not comite  
this charge, as the places before quo-  
ted do shew. For the Lord hath in his  
word, ordained not onely offices, the  
executors whereof shoulde haue the  
ouerfight of soules, but also the per-  
sons who were to execute those fun-  
ctions. 1. Cor. 12. 28. 1. Pet. 4. 10. rom  
12. 6. 7. 8. Ephes. 4. 7. 11. Now vnprea-  
ching ministers are non of those per-  
sons, because the Lorde knoweth the  
not to bee able to feede soules. And  
let not men bee so iniurious vnto  
the Lorde, as to affirme, that hee ac-  
cording vnto his reuealed ordinance  
(for



(for therof I speke as of a ministry, & not of his secret iudgments) bequeathed the soules of men to be starued and kept from saluation, As hee must needes be conuincd to doe if he bequeathed them vnto those men, the dispensation of whose ministry is able to beget none, feede none, saue none. you must vnderstande againe, that I speake of the ministry whereby readers are ministers, that is of their owne, and not of the ministry whereby preaching ministers are ministers, wherewith readers haue nothing to doe.

Moreouer howe can the Lorde bee saide to commit the charge of soules according to his owne reuealed ordinance, vnto those who may truely object vnto him, that he dealeth iniuriously with the, by exacting those thinges to bee perfourmed at their handes and in their owne persons, as necessary duties of their callings, vnto the performaunce whereof, they haue receiued no abilitie from him. Is man to bee answerable vnto the  
Lord

Lorde of that which he neuer recey-  
 ued? doth the Lorde require the vse  
 of that tallent which hee neuer be-  
 stowed? doth he laye that vpon any,  
 whereof hee may haue iuste cause to  
 complaine? when did hee impose a  
 charge vpon any, vnto whom he gaue  
 not gifts to discharge the same? now  
 the charge of foules whiche he com-  
 mitteth vnto anye, hee requireth at  
 their handes vnto whom he hath co-  
 mitted it, which he could not doe, if  
 hee had not giuen abilitie to the dis-  
 charge thereof.

What then? shall ignoraunt mini-  
 sters be free from the blood of soules,  
 in asmuch as the lord neuer comitted  
 any soule vnto their charge. It were  
 well with the poore men, if the case  
 so stood. But alas it is not so. And yet  
 the cause of their destruction proce-  
 deth not from their vnfaithfulnesse  
 in the discharge of that vocation  
 whiche hee hath allotted vnto them,  
 but it commeth iustly vpon them, in  
 that they haue desperatly thrust the-  
 selues contrary vnto Gods reuealed  
 will

will, vpon those men with the ouersight of whose soules God neuer trusted such as they are. The Lord sayth vnto them, intrude your selues and you will, vnto the places of pastors, and so enforce me to bring heavy & swift damnation vpon you: but surely I wil bequeath no soule vnto your custodye. They on the other side in their practise say, Lord whether thou committest vnto vs any charge of any soule or no, wee care not, but rather then wee shoulde not haue the meanes to liue in this life, (for this is their onely scope in continuinge in the ministrye) require the blood of soules, and what thou wilt at our hands. And so senseles men, they sell them-selues, body and soule vnto euerlasting wo and destruction.

The pretence that the Lord committeth the charge of soules vnto their ministry, and not vnto them, is first a desiring of that in question; (for they are denyed to haue any ministry) and oherwise many waies vn sufficient. 1. Because the Lord commit-

Act. 20. 28.

teth not the charge of soules there, where the punishment of their destruction cannot take holde, as it can not vpon the ministry: 2 the ministry is but a dead thing of it self; most beautifull in deed, as being an ordinance of the Lorde, but able to saue none, vnlesse it be committed vnto a person, who in the execution therof, is able to shew himself to be appointed of God for that glorious worke. This is taught Ephes. 4. where the Apostle verses 6 and 7. hauing spoken of the giftes bestowed vpon men for this ministeriall work, ascribeth vers. 11. 12. the gathering together of the sayntes, not vnto the giftes or functions, but vnto men endued with the sayde giftes. For he doth not say that the Lord hath appointed for the gathering together of the saynts, an apostleshipp, a pastorall or doctorall function, &c. but that he ordained apostles, pastors, &c. for that end and purpose; whereunto because our readers were not appoynted, it forcibly ensueth that they haue no ministry,  
no



no pastorall or doctorall function,  
and so are no ministers: which con-  
clusiō also in the last edition of mine  
Exhortation vnto my cōntrimen, I  
haue enforced by manye strong and  
as I am assured inuincible reasons,  
drawne out of the infallible trueth of  
Gods worde. I woulde intreate yon  
M.*Some*, when you haue answered the  
reasons I haue nowe set downe to  
answere also, the 1. 2. 3. and 25. rea-  
son that I haue there vsed. For you  
shall but strue in vayne against the  
conclusion, as long as the premises  
whereby it is inferred remaine firme.  
If the reader woulde be further satis-  
fied in this poynte concerning the  
dumbe ministry, he is to be referred  
vnto that which in the aforelaid trea-  
tise I haue set downe.

Nowe to the conclusion, If vnprea-  
ching ministers be no ministers, and  
if I cannot be assured to receiue a sa-  
crament, but onely at the hands of a  
minister; both which you see M.*Some*  
to be prooued by me, then cannot  
I assure my selfe, that an vnpreaching  
mini-

minister can deliver a sacrament vnto me: and therefore it is vnlawfull for me or any christian to go vnto an vnpreaching minister for the sacraments; if vnlawfull, then a sinne, if a sin, the the godly are polluted which goe vnto them for the sacramentes: you know (M. Some) what I meane by an vnpreaching minister; namely, euery one learned or vnlearned, that cannot shewe him-selfe by the good trial of his gifts, to haue that fitnes to teach, whereof we read, 2. tim. 2. 2, 1. tim. 3. 3. which ability the Lord doth not ordinarily bestowe vpon any in these our dayes, without the knowledge of the artes, especially the two handmaydes of all learninge, Rhetoricke and Logick, and the two originall tongues wherein the worde was written. And therefore I am as farre from accounting the vnskillfull preachers, which speake hand overhead, they care not what; against whom your complaint is very iust to be ministers, as I am from acknowledging many of our absurd doctors to

to be apt to teach, who can bring nothing into the pulpit, but that which other men haue written, and that very often, so fir to the purpose, of edification, as the reason from the corner to the staffe, is soundly concluded. In these three sortes of supposed ministers (and there could be a fourth added vnto them) consisteth the woe of our Church.

The rest of your booke is nowe to be examined. Your conclusion, page 22. that they which were baptized by vnpreaching ministers, are rightly baptized as touching the substance of baptisme; I do not gainsay, Your reasons are weake. For how coulde wee proue your conclusion, if men should denie popish baptism to be true baptism, as I do not you know & he should do me great iniurie, which would lay that to my charge. Were it sufficient for vs to say they were Katabaptistes which denie popishe baptism? How could this be proued? and this should not proue the matter doubted off. Shall wee saye that they sinne, in not pre-

presenting themselves to be bapti-  
 zed. To whome shoulde they present  
 themselves? who would baptize them?  
 Admit they sinned in receauing the  
 Lords Supper before they were bap-  
 tized, should they therefore bee be-  
 reaued of the comfort of baptisme?  
 to affirme that this weare a goinge  
 backward, is no reason, because they  
 were perswaded that they had bap-  
 tisme, otherwise they would not haue  
 beene so farr on their iourney, vntill  
 they had beene accompanied there-  
 with. But they omitted baptisme of  
 ignorance and not of contempt: ther-  
 fore they denie the receiuing of the  
 Lordes supper to haue bene a sinne,  
 anye more then it woulde be a sinne  
 in them nowe to receiue the Lordes  
 supper, if they coulde not haue bap-  
 tisme, Baptisme they woulde haue, if  
 they coulde orderlye come by the  
 same. Because men will bee so iniuri-  
 ous vnto them, as to denie them the  
 comfort of baptisme which they can-  
 not haue, should they denie to them-  
 selues the comfort of the Lords sup-  
 per



per which they may haue? Ye, but no  
 vncircumcised might eat the pascall  
 lambe. Exod. 12. 48. True; But what  
 shall we say vnto those that were vn-  
 circumcised in the wildernesse fortie  
 yeres almost. Iosh. 5. 5. Did they ne-  
 uer eat the passeouer all that time?  
 If they did, the place of Exodus will  
 be quickly answered. It is plaine that  
 the passeouer was celebrated in the  
 wildernes once at the least. Nom. 9. 13.  
 If euery yeare, why should the godly  
 of the family be excluded from the  
 [family be excluded from the] action,  
 the cause why they were vncircum-  
 cised not being in them. None vncir-  
 cumcised might minister before the  
 altar. True, but did non of the Levites  
 that were borne in the wildernesse  
 teach Isaacob the law, or offer the in-  
 cense of his God in all those fourtye  
 yeares?

Thus many thinges you see might  
 be obiected against your reasons, &c.  
 I take the obiections to bee of some  
 waight, It had bin well you had con-  
 sidered of them before you had pub-  
 lished

lished your booke. And the baptisme by vnpreaching ministers, must haue better proofes then anye you haue brought as yet, or else I feare me, our posterities will not be satisfied therewith.

Your next reason, page 23. is slender. Readers pronounce the wordes of institution with the deliuerie of the element, therefore saye you they deliuer a sacrament: you haue once already alledged this to prooue popish baptisme, page 20. I haue answered it page 29. 30. 31. And the place of Matth. 28. 19. brought in by you page 23. proueth your consequent to bee false. For it sheweth that he who is to baptise, must bee also able to teache, which abilitie is wanting in our readers. Go sayth our Saniour, and teach all nations, baptizing, &c. Therefore if he that deliuereth the element bee not able to teach, we cannot be assured that it is a sacrament. Because the commandement is not generally to all that could pronounce the wordes of institution, beeing thereunto per-  
mit.

mitted by the corruptiō of the time,  
 but perticularly limited vnto them  
 that can teache, vnlesse you will saye,  
 that the Lorde biddeth the go teach,  
 who cannot teach whiche were not  
 once to be conceined of his maiestie.  
 The corruptiō in the Church of Eng-  
 land, that the deliuey of the element  
 shold be seuered from the preaching  
 of the word, is a breach of Gods or-  
 dinance, you cannot deny. Matth. 28  
 19. act. 20. 7. and therefore vngodly  
 and intollerable. Whether it mak the  
 action frustrate or no, that is not the  
 question.

Your 3. reason pag. 24. is this.

Vnpredaching ministers do ad an e-  
 difying word vnto the element, ther-  
 fore it is a sacramento. This reason is  
 the same with the former, which she-  
 weth the great nakednes and pouer-  
 ty of the cause, that one reason must  
 be thrise periured to proue the good-  
 nes of it, which notwithstanding it  
 cānot shew. I deny the antecedent, &  
 consequent. Your reason of the an-  
 tecedent, that the recitall of the sum

of Christs Sermon that is, the wordes  
of institution is an edifying worde is  
false, and maintaineth charming. For  
do you thinke that the worde of in-  
stitution, being as you say, the summ  
of Christs Sermon, is then an edify-  
ing word, whensoever it is recited by  
a profane person, even in the profa-  
nation of Gods ordinance? Looke 2.  
tim. 4. 3. and you shall finde that the  
worde barely reade, and to no other  
purpose then to edifie by reading, is  
not wholesome doctrine. The popish  
prieste cyther without or, within the  
booke, pronounceth in his darke La-  
tine, the summ of Christs Sermon, is  
that an edifying word, which he pro-  
fanely breatheth. The worde of God  
vttered, is not an edifying worde, vn-  
les it be vttered according to the or-  
dinance, both in regarde of the per-  
sons that vtter the same, and the end  
wherefore it is vttered. No learned  
man will denie the Lordes prayer  
rightly sayd to be an edifying worde.  
And yet by your leane, no learned  
man vnlesse he fauoreth charming or  
pope-



popery, will say that the Lords prayer pronounced by an ignorant man, in a strange tongue, or profaned by a witch, is an edifying word.

Concerning your consequent, doe you thinke that euerye one that can ad an edifying word vnto the elemēt, may minister a sacrament? it is not so. For Paul requireth the words of euery christian (wemen & al) to be edifying wordes, Eph. 4.29. even in common talk. Shal therefore the element administred by euerye christian be a sacrament? God forbid. And yet euery christian can ad the sum of Christs sermon vnto the element in the administration of the supper; which if it were sufficient, as by your reason it is, then wemen, children, &c. idiots that coulde not read might deliuer a sacrament.

The reason concluding vnpreaching ministers to be non, because they are not apt to teache, you haue twise repeated within one twelue lines, pag 24.25. and made two seuerall objections thereof. That was an oversight.  
the

The sufficiencie of the argument, I  
have shewed to be suche, as Caiphas  
his ministry, and Herods magistracy  
brought in by you, pag. 25. 26. will ne-  
uer answer the same. Both of them  
with the reason from the outwarde  
calling of readers, pag. 25. I referre to  
your next chapter, where they are re-  
peated: thither nowe I am come,  
where the contradictorie of the que-  
stion shall be set downe and proved  
briefly, because the nullitie of the vn-  
preaching ministry, may be in steede  
of a 1000. reasons to proue the same.  
By pollution, I doubt not, you meane  
sinne.

*The godly do finne, which do communicate  
with unpreaching ministers.*

Because 1. they communicate with  
those who are no ministers. 2. they  
cannot be assured to receive a sacra-  
ment at their hands. 3. they do not  
examine them-selues aright, and so  
are not worthy receivers, 1. Cor. 11.  
28. inasmuch as they do not acknow-  
ledg it a sinne to communicat where  
there is no minister. 4. because they  
either

eyther make the element to bee a sacrament naturally in it selfe; and not by the ordinance of God, or els think the ordinance of God in the institution of the sacrament onely to consist in the recitall of the words; I baptize thee, &c. or take eate, &c. whereas a minister is a most principall part of the ordinance. 5 Because they make the sacraments to be marks no more essentiall vnto the Church, then to other idolatrous synagogues. For the element may be deliuered out of the Church by a publike person, euen as substantially, as by our mere readers. 6 They approoue the sin of the vnpreaching ministry. Lastly, because they are perswaded, that Christ doth deliuer vnto them the seales of their saluation, by the hands of those that are not ministers; to wit, by vnpreaching readers. In al which points, the godly sinne, and therefore are polluted in communicating with vnpreaching ministers. Nowe let vs see howe you haue proued the contrary.

Where the reader must againe be put

put in minde, that 1 you haue prooued nothing vnlesse the question bee graunted vnto you: and 2 that your reasons are repeated too often.

The ministers ignorance saye you, page 28. cannot peruert Gods ordinance: and againe, page 29. the sacramentes are not the worse for the ignorance of the minister, &c. All this I grant, but bare readers are not ministers, and the doubt is, whether the action performed by them be the ordinance of God, whether it be a sacramēt. These be the questions which you ought to haue prooued, and not haue taken the as principles, though you do this: the 3 and 4 time, pag 28. line 6. and 24.

M.D. Some, pag. 28. the worthy partaker receiues a blessing, if a blessing no pollution.

*John Penri*; first it is doubted whether we may be assured that it is a sacrament; 2 he is no worthy receiver that receiueth of an Idoll minister: 3. there may be a blessing received, & yet pollution in the receiver:

Looke



• • • Looke 2. Chronic. 30. 17. 18. 19. Nom. 9. 7.  
The obiection concerning the giver  
& the receiuer, in your 3 1. pa. was ne-  
uer mine: I could turne it against  
you, but I must be brieve.

Concerning the nullity of our rea-  
ders ministry, we are to knowe that  
there is a nullitie of a ministerye be-  
fore God; eyther because the action  
proceedeth from a corrupt minister,  
as psalm. 50. 16. whom God would not  
haue to deale with his ordinances, or  
from a corrupt and euill ministerye,  
which is none of Gods ordinaunce.  
The action of the former is substan-  
tiall in regard of vs, of the latter wee  
know no substance it can haue. Of the  
former there is a nullitie onely in the  
sight of God; of the latter, both in re-  
spect of the Lorde and also of vs. The  
nullitie of our readers ministry is of  
this latter sorte, namely suche as we  
ought in no wise to account a mini-  
stery. Whereas therefore you graunt  
that there is a nullity of our readers  
ministry before God, and yet affirm  
them to be ministers, you swarpe fro  
the

Isa. 56. 9.

Ier. 29. 31.

Zac. 14. 14.

29. 9. Zach

13. 5. Iere.

29. 25.

There is a difference betweene the nullitie of the minister, and the nullity of the ministry.

the point, and so your answer, page 31. Is nothinge to the purpose, but a desiring of the question after your vsuall manner. As Caiphas then, and the rest of the sleepey dogges against whom the prophet cryeth out, were wicked men, God woulde not haue such to be his ministers: hyther refer Isa. 1. 11. but as they had the ministry which God allowed of, they were ministers vnto the people. This ministry, our readers want, therefore they can be ministers, neither in respect of the Lord, nor of the Church. Shemaiah was a wicked man, and a false prophet, so were the rest of his stamp. The Lord detested both the & their ministry. Zephania & Caiphas hie priests with their cōpany, were as wicked as any of the false prophetes, the Lord abhorred the mē, but their ministry was his ordinance. Hence M. Some, it followeth, that neyther the bribery of your Caiphas, nor the blindenes of your ignorant Levites, can make suche a nullitie of their priesthood, as they should be no priests

priests unto the people. And therefore great reason while the parentes of our saviour, & the rest of the godly whereof you speake. page 28, 29. should not leave the service of God for the pollution of the priests. Isai speaketh against blind watchmen, 56 10, but chap. 42. 19. 20. It shal appear that they saw many things, but kept them not, I pray you confer the places and it can never be prooned that any of them were so blinde, as they could not declare by preaching the generall vse of the sacrifices and ceremonies. Their wants might be many but not like the insufficiency of our readers. Be it they were as insufficient yet their ministry might be allowable. For

*Virginnes to teach, made not a nullitie of the  
Leuiticall priests office.*

Because 1 it was sufficient to make him a lawfull, though not a good priest, for him to be of the line of Aaron: 2 there was no commandemet concerning the tryall of his fitnes to teach: 3 It is not mentioned that

Nom. 3. 10  
Leuit. 8.  
Exo. 29.

any were put from the priesthood for want of this ability, whereas the doubt whether they were the sonnes of Aaron. Exa. 2. 63. and their idolatry, 2. Act. 21. 26. Chron. 23. 9. bereaued them thereof, 4. the example of Paule confirmeth this, who communicated since his conuersion with those priests that were as vnlearned as euery one, which he would not haue done if inability to teach, had made them no priests.

Nowe therefore M. *Some* to make your argument from the Leuiticall priesthood to bee forcible. For your vnprecking ministers, you must proue that either our readers ministry is a Leuiticall ministry, that the continuance thereof is vnder the new covenat or shew that the corrupt approbation, for so I name the best outward calling they can haue of the Church, is as forcible to make the ministers, as was the ordinance of God to make the sons of Aaron sacrificing at Ierusalem to be priests. Now,

*That the corrupt allowance of the Church cannot make our readers to be substantiall ministers.*

For



For so all men and women, without  
 or within the Church might be capa-  
 ble of the ministry, because all may  
 be capable of this outward allowace;  
 2 and peticularly a man, not furni-  
 shed with naturall capacity; 3 a man  
 that could not read, though he wan-  
 ted also the gift of interpretation; for  
 suche a one might recite the liturgie  
 without the booke; 4 the Church  
 might make a man minister against  
 his will, though he should neuer con-  
 sent therunto. And this is the willing-  
 nes that I meane, when I say that the  
 inward caling is contained in the suf-  
 ficiency of gifts, & willingnes to pra-  
 ctize, which willingnes I gather vpon  
 the wordes, *Epith' mei* and *oregetai*, v-  
 sed of the Apostle. Your reason ther-  
 fore from the malicious Philippian  
 ministers, toucheth not the question.  
 Thus Caiphas with his crue of vn-  
 worthye and monstrous priests (who  
 within a fewe pages, in your booke  
 haue impudently so often troubled  
 the reader) is answered. And I thinke  
 it a great iudgment of God that the  
 orna-

1. Tim. 3. 1.

ornaments of our English and welch  
ministry, for the most part consisteth  
in the deformitie of suche lothsome  
spots,

M.D. Some page 32. They of whose  
magistracie there is a nullitye before  
God, though they haue an outwarde  
calling, ought not to bee accounted  
magistrates. / P. You demand what I  
thinke of this proposition. Surely my  
iudgement is, that it is altogether  
without sence, and ouerthroweth it  
self. For it is as if you said, he of whose  
fayth there is a nullitye before God,  
though he be assured of his saluation  
is not to be accounted a faythful mā.  
Why? to be assured of saluation, & to  
haue a nullitie of fayth before God,  
cannot stand together. No more can  
the outward calling of the magistra-  
cy stand with the nullity thereof. For  
the outwarde calling maketh a sub-  
stantiall magistrate.

*There be three essentiall differences betwene an  
euill magistrate and a reading minister*

1 The outwarde calling of an euill  
magistrate, maketh him a substantial  
magi-

magistrate, so cannot the outwandering of readers make them to be ministers. 2. The magistracie of an euill magistrate, may be allowable before God, so cannot the ministry of readers. 3. Men may be assured to receiue that accordinge to the ordinance of God substantially at the handes of an euill magistrate, which concerneth them to haue from him, so can they not of a bare reader. For there is no man that can assure himselfe to be partaker of a substantiall sacrament, at the hands of such, and preache they cannot. I haue handled this poynte of the magistracie in my former booke, from page 47. to 51.

But M. Some, where is that reason which you could presse so far? is this it? they of whose magistracie there is a nullity before God, ought not to be accounted magistrates. I say your proposition is true, assume what you wil, you know what maner of nullity I meane.

My reason concluding the unlawfulness of communicatinge with readers

ders having but an outward calling:  
 because it is a sinne to communicate  
 with them, whiche onely want the  
 same having fitness to teache, is such  
 as I can not but marvel that you  
 would thinke it could bee answered  
 by a desiring of the question, which is  
 a fault in reasoninge, wherein be like  
 you seeme to take delight; you say a-  
 gaine, that readers deliver a sacra-  
 ment. How can we be sure thereof, &  
 why may not I say as well, that a man  
 indued with giftes to teach, doth de-  
 liver a sacrament, though he have no  
 outward calling, whiche assertion  
 would be false. By an extraordinarye  
 sacrament, I meane baptisme or the  
 Lords supper, administred either pri-  
 marly by a minister, or any way by on  
 that is no minister. I never affirmed,  
 the elements delivered by readers to  
 be sacraments. It is one thing not to  
 deny them, another thing to affirme  
 them to be sacraments; the former I  
 have written, the latter I never did; &  
 they doe my writings great iniurie,  
 that report the contrary.

Thus



Thus M. ~~Some~~ I have run through  
 the pointes in your booke that con-  
 cerned me, I have bene drinen to  
 deale briefly therein. I had determi-  
 ned, and I am inforced to ende, and  
 to omit that, which page 9. line 11. I  
 promised to handle in the latter end,  
 with diners other. I have not the like  
 libertie for printing that you M. ~~Some~~  
 doe inloy. Let me but haue the fauor  
 to bee iudicially heard according to  
 the word, and I will personally vpon  
 the perill of my life, defend these two  
 points against all men. I am sory that  
 you whom I reuerence, should be the  
 instrument to oppugne a trueth,

The Lord respect the cause of  
 his owne glorie, and par-  
 don our sinne.

Amen.

### ERRATA.

Page 1, line 20. & 23. for 2. read 3.  
 pag. 47. line 14. blot out, family be  
 excluded from the

His own little subject



bir more bulmuş

